

Exhibit "7"

Q: Why do you think that management's actions were based on your race/national origin and reprisal?

46. This is part of a pattern of adverse actions and disparity in treatment. I was the only Senior that was treated differently in the Service of a PWP. Each and every other non-Latino Senior was served their PWP on 05/06/98 and rated during the correct rating period with this PWP. This was done with the same individual(s), it happened in the same general scheme of the PWP services and with the same effect-causing a racially hostile work environment and a continuing pattern of harassment at my work location against me. I also feel that this was done in an attempt to force me out of the Senior unit and back to Los Angeles.

ISSUE 5: 1/26/98 – ASSIGNED A CASE WITHOUT DISCUSSING THE TIME LINE FOR A KEY EVENT

Q: What was the "key event"? Are such events always discussed? What is the normal turn-around for a case like the one in question? Did you have time to do it? Did others? Could someone else have been assigned?

47. A criminal history check was done on a Japanese male attempting to enter the US. This check was done at a U.S. Embassy in Japan and the male's inspection was deferred until the results of the check came back. Because of the time difference (19 hours) this check came back to the port and was available when Kelly Brehm arrived in the morning at 6:00 am.
48. Based on this positive record check, Kelly Brehm knew that it required that we call the alien back in, initiate refusal proceedings against him and put him on the next available plane. The Key Event is the refusal and subsequent escort to the plane for a departure back to Japan.
49. Kelly Brehm knew that I had to retrieve the Japanese alien in question that day because, when criminal activity is determined, the alien is called back to the airport and placed on the next plane home. Kelly, however, held the document until 10:30 a.m. before telling me that the alien had a criminal background. I believe that Kelly Brehm withheld this information simply to pressure me.

Q: Have other Senior Immigration Inspectors received cases where key events have not been discussed? Who? Explain.

50. To my knowledge, no other Senior Immigration Inspector has been subjected to undue pressure like I was in this instance. It is common for Senior Immigration Inspectors to help one another when aliens have to be retrieved. I was left to handle this situation myself. I have only been left in a lurch like this once.

However, I believe that the incident was part of a bigger pattern of discrimination and harassment based on my national origin. Kelly Brehm intentionally set me up and placed an unreasonable expectation on me to get the job done. Kelly Brehm manipulated a situation in which he controlled all the factors and had complete control of all the individuals involved. Kelly Brehm applied undue pressure and anxiety on me by manipulating the time table so there was only the least amount of time available for me to process this time sensitive case. He applied an unreasonable expectation and it was part of a pattern of adverse actions, disparity in treatment and a continuing pattern of harassment at my work location against me, as will be shown in ISSUE 6 where he also placed undue pressure and anxiety on me by ordering me to complete cases within a given time frame.

ISSUE 6: 1/28/97 - ORDERED TO COMPLETE THREE CASE FILES BY
CLOSE OF BUSINESS AND

ISSUE 7: 1/28/98 -ORDERED NOT TO TALK TO OTHER SENIOR IMMIGRATION
INSPECTORS ABOUT WORK

Q: Please put this in context. Was there a real deadline or was the deadline artificial? How long had you been working on the cases? Was this longer than usual? What is the normal turn around time? Had you or others been asked to meet such deadlines before? If so, who, when?

51. At 8:00 a.m., on January 28, 1998, Kelly Brehm handed me a written assignment that ordered me to complete three cases. I arrive on duty at 5:30 a.m. SSRI Brehm comes in at 6:00 a.m. I believe that both Kelly Brehm's timing in presenting me with this assignment and the deadlines he imposed were intended simply to harass me. No Senior Immigration Inspectors had ever before been given deadlines for cases, to my knowledge..
52. The first case was not on my desk or in the file cabinet under its assigned file number. Although I was assigned this case, the traveling companion of this individual became of interest to another Senior inspector, and it is suspected that he took this case from my desk or the file cabinet where it was housed. Obviously, this case could not be completed if the original file put together by me could not be located based on the fact that someone had taken the file.
53. The second case was the criminal prosecution case that I was assigned. During the period that this prosecution case was being completed by me, a parallel prosecution case was being done by Senior Inspector (SRI) Claude Kojima. The arrival date for my subject was 12/05/97. The arrival date for SRI Kojima's subject was 12/04/97. The arraignment date for my subject was 12/08/97. The arraignment date for SRI Kojima's subject was 12/09/97. The plea date for both my subject and SRI Kojima's subject was 12/18/97. Because the plea dates were